

### REMARKS

Applicants' attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given to this case. As explained below in detail, the claims have been amended to overcome the rejection thereof under 35 USC 112. For convenience, the matters raised in the Office action are discussed below in the same order as presented by the Examiner.

In paragraph 2 of the action, claims 12-19 and 26 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, based on the recitation that the drawing slot and the diffuser inlet opening each have a "sufficient" lateral extent to receive the curtain of filaments. As indicated, the word "sufficient" has been cancelled from each of claims 12 and 26, at each occurrence thereof.

In paragraph 3 of the action, claims 12-19 and 26 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. These rejections are overcome by amendment of claims 12 and 26 to delete the recitation that the drawing slots are "free of setbacks adjacent the outlet opening". This recitation was particularly intended to distinguish Geus '500 and the teaching therein that the setback or setbacks 9 are required. The claimed constant horizontal cross-section precludes the possibility of the setbacks contrary to the teaching in the Geus '500

patent. Accordingly, the claim has been rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, and to retain the distinguishing features over the cited prior art.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12-24 and 26 are in condition for final allowance and such action is requested.

If there are any fees required by this Amendment, please charge the same to Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. 34051.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Joseph J. Corso, Reg. No. 25845

1801 East Ninth Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108

(216) 579-1700

June 13, 2005